

TAB

~~SECRET~~TAB JRecommendation A. 10.

1. We do not concur in this recommendation.
2. The two chief reasons advanced for the proposal that two or more classes of field offices be established are: first, that the burden of responsibility is not equal in all offices, and second, that the present structure provides no flexibility for progressive assignments.
3. It can readily be conceded that the chief of a large field office has more administrative responsibility than the chief of a smaller office; however, administrative responsibility is only one basis for the selection of a field chief, nor is it his major responsibility. Essentially, it is his mission to represent the Agency in his area, to convey to business and educational leaders the nature and importance of the Agency's mission, and to obtain and maintain their cooperation and support. It is thus quite as important to the Agency that its mission be well presented at the highest possible level to the [redacted] for example, as it is that the Agency be well represented in areas where the concentration of such organizations may be higher.
4. Also, it has never been felt that either the Agency or an individual field chief would profit from progressive field assignments. To the highest degree possible, field chiefs were selected because of their stature in, and knowledge of, their own areas; and the value of continuity of contact over the years has been proven time and time again. The futility of uprooting a life-long resident of [redacted], for example, for "promotion" to a totally strange area, such as [redacted], and the transfer of a [redacted] chief having life-time interests in the Far East, to the [redacted] would appear obvious. To the Agency it would mean the loss of the value of long personal associations; to the individual it would provide no advancement or advantage whatsoever. Most of the field chiefs joined the Agency at a considerable financial sacrifice, consequently a promotion of one grade would hardly be a factor.
5. It should also be pointed out that a field chief, whatever the size of his office, is required to establish and maintain cordial and workable relationships with most of the federal and local governmental and military elements in his area. These include the Commanding General and G-2 of the various Army Districts, the Commandant and DIO of the Naval Districts, those in charge of local federal agencies, generally the Governor of the state,

25X1A

25X1A6a

25X1A6a

25X1A6a

25X1A6a

~~SECRET~~

TAB J (contd.)

and many of the senior local officials and law enforcement officers. The location of these districts and the stature of these officials do not necessarily parallel the intelligence factors which determine the size of CIA's field offices; the Agency should be well represented at all of its principal locations.